

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 50.—No. 7.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1824. [Price 1s.

KENSINGTON TURNPIKE.

Kensington, 12th May, 1824.

IN my last I gave an account of a Petition from me to the House of Commons, on the subject of a Bill, which had been petitioned for by certain persons of the Kensington "*Trust*," as it is called, and which had, before my petition could reach the House of Commons, gone from that House and got into the Lords. Here I left the matter last week, when I observed, however, that it must be brought forward again.

The Bill had passed the Commons and was gone to the Lords. I pursued it with my petition; but, quick as I was, the Bill had been *read a second time* before my petition could get before their Lordships. But, it had to go into a *committee*, and I now found, that it was *there*, and not at the *bar* of

the House, that I should have to go, if I chose, to be heard against the Bill. Thither I went on the 11th instant; and the result was, that the Committee of their Lordships (by a vote that I shall speak of presently) *put an end to the Bill*.

I, together with others, had petitioned against this Bill *before*, and of this petition I shall speak by-and-by. My present petition was grounded on a *gross falsehood contained in the preamble of the Bill*, and which falsehood, gross as it was, had been *enacted by the House of Commons*, not intentionally, to be sure; but, the thing had been done.

This is a matter of very great importance to the public. It is a subject that we all ought to understand. I shall, therefore, make it as clear as I can; and shall begin by inserting again (in a clearer way than last week) the *account* of this famous "*TRUST*." I shall speak enough of it hereafter. At present, I shall insert it in due form.

N

General Statement of the **INCOME** and **EXPENDITURE**
1st day of January, and the

EXPENDITURE.		£. s. d.
To Surveyor's Accounts of Day-labour, between the first day of January and the 31st day of December 1823, for maintenance or repair of roads, and watering the same }		2187 8 5
Team labour for the same period, including water-carts and clearing the roads		745 1 6
Watching the roads		563 11 6
Contractors' and workmen's bills, for materials supplied for maintenance and repair of roads and foot-paths .. }		4774 13 5
Repair or maintenance of toll-houses, gates, lamp-posts, and new toll-boards		258 1 0
Lighting the roads		684 17 11
Purchase of land for widening the roads, building a brick sewer under the surface of the road instead of an open sewer, and a new fence to widen the road .. }		938 11 6
Ten turnpike bonds paid off.....		1000 0 0
Salaries and other payments of clerk, surveyors or other officers		618 5 0
Printing, advertising and stationery		48 11 0
Interest of bond debts		108 19 7
Annual sum paid to the Commissioners of Paving, of St. George, Hanover-square		1000 0 0
Commissioners of Hans Town.....		140 0 0
Incidental charges		96 1 6
		£13,164 2 4

GENERAL STATEMENT OF

	£ s. d.
An Account of the Amount of Debt bearing Interest } (£1000 of which has subsequently been paid)..... }	2500 0 0
An Account of Interest due	50 0 0
An Account of Floating Debt.....	875 9 0
	£ 3425 9 0

of the Kensington, &c. Turnpike Roads, between the
31st day of December, 1823.

INCOME.

	£	s.	d.
By Balance in Treasurer's hands	3147	17	4
Amount of one year's rent received from the lessees of } the Tolls	14000	0	0
Compositions in lieu of statute labour for the year.....	324	0	0
By incidental receipts	195	9	10
	<hr/>		
	£ 17667	7	2

DEBTS AND CREDITS.

	£	s.	d.
Accruing rent of Tolls	1166	13	4
Composition due from parishes	228	10	0
	<hr/>		
	£ 1395	3	4

GEORGE BARKER,

Chairman.

Now we come to my Petition to the Lords, which I insert, and I number the paragraphs for the sake of easy reference.

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

The Petition of William Cobbett, of Kensington, in the County of Middlesex,

Most humbly Sheweth,

1. That there is now a Bill before your Right Honourable House, entitled, "A Bill for more effectually repairing, widening, and improving the Road from Hyde Park Corner to Counter's Bridge, and certain other Roads, in the County of Middlesex, and for lighting, watching, and watering the said Roads."

2. That, in the Preamble to the said Bill are the following words:—"And whereas the Trustees appointed by or in pursuance of the said two recited Acts (meaning the two local Acts) have repaired and improved the said Roads, and have made great progress in carrying into execution the powers and authorities thereby vested in them; and, although they have discharged and paid off part of the monies borrowed on the credit of the tolls authorized to be taken upon the said Roads, a considerable sum remains undischarged and cannot be paid off, and the said annual

sum of one thousand pounds be paid to the said Committee of Paving for St. George, Hanover-square; nor can the said Roads be effectually amended, widened and improved, and maintained in repair, unless the term and powers granted by the two first recited Acts be continued, and further provisions be made for that purpose."

3. That these words contain a barefaced falsehood, as will be seen by your Right Honourable House in the following statement of the pecuniary affairs of this Road.

4. That this statement has been obtained by your Petitioner, agreeably to the Act, from the Clerk of the Peace of the County of Middlesex; that your Petitioner is ready to prove at your Bar the authenticity of this statement, which is in the following words, to wit:—

[*Here the Account was inserted.*]

5. That, according to the foregoing account, these Roads owe but one thousand five hundred pounds, while the Treasurer has now in his hands four thousand five hundred and three pounds, and that he had, at the settlement before the last, upwards of three thousand pounds in his hands, while he was charging the Road for interest of borrowed money.

6. That, therefore, the above quoted part of the Preamble of

this Bill is wholly false; that the principal pretence for passing the Bill is unfounded; that the present Local Act does not expire for two years yet to come; that a new Act is not yet wanted; that if this Bill pass, it will contain a flagrant falsehood, and will be greatly injurious to the public, and will encourage and foster a most scandalous job; and that, therefore, your Petitioner most humbly prays, that the said Bill may not pass; and that he may be heard against it at the bar of your Right Honourable House.

And your Petitioner
will ever pray.

WM. COBBETT.

The reader will perceive, that, by this Petition I became pledged to *prove the preamble of the Bill to be false*. I understand, that the mode of proceeding with Bills of this sort, before both Houses of Parliament, is this: Those who petition for the Bill, cause it to be prepared; to be drawn up, in short. It is then brought into the House, read a first time, and also a second time if not objected to. After this, it is *referred to a Committee*. The business of this Committee is, first, to inquire into the grounds of the Bill, or the reasons for passing such a Bill. Then the

Committee has to see that the enactments or provisions contained in the Bill, be consonant with, and adequate to, the grounds for passing the Bill. But, first of all, the Committee are to look well to these grounds. The statement of these grounds is called the *Preamble* of the Bill; and preamble means, introductory statement.

The Committee are to take special care that every thing which is alleged in this statement be **TRUE**. Therefore, they first set to work, very methodically, to examine witnesses, and to have proof brought before them of the truth of every part of the preamble. With regard to the present Bill, all this ceremony was gone through in the House of Commons. The Committee of that Honourable House *proved* the preamble to be true. That Honourable House, whose character and wisdom were so highly extolled by Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON; that Honourable body, after having proved the preamble or basis of the Bill to be true, built an Act upon this foundation, and having sent the whole of it to the Lords, their Act is met in the Lords by my Petition, declaring this very preamble to contain a *barefaced falsehood!* Now, then, either this Act, which had come up

from the Commons, did contain a barefaced falsehood, or my Petition was not only false but most outrageously impudent. Many of my readers will tremble for me when they see this positive assertion opposed to an enactment of the House of Commons.

Therefore, in order to tranquilize their minds, I will, before I go any further, state what was the decision of the Committee of the Lords. The Bill had been read a second time in the House of Lords, it had been referred to a Committee, of which Lord HOLLAND was the Chairman. This Committee, like that of the Commons, first set to work to *prove the preamble of the Bill*; that is to say, to prove the truth of it, if that truth could be proved.

The first three paragraphs of the preamble merely state that there are certain other Acts in existence relative to this road. The truth of this part of the preamble was proved by merely producing the Acts of Parliament, the titles of which were recited in the paragraphs just mentioned. But, when they came to that paragraph of the preamble which is quoted in my petition, and which forms the second paragraph of that petition; when they came to this paragraph of the preamble,

the petitioners for the Bill had to call *witnesses*, of whom we shall see more by-and-by. When they had done with their witnesses, I, who had no witnesses to call, was permitted to address the Committee. I had the honour to lay before their Lordships some, and only some of my objections to this Bill; and I, in a particular manner, dwelt upon the above-mentioned paragraph in the preamble, which I insisted the witnesses who had been called had not only not proved to be true, but had, as far as they had gone, proved to be false.

I had opposed to me Mr. PHILLIMORE, a Chancery Lawyer, and brother to the Blue and Buff Captain that so gallantly beat Mr. JAMES the Historian. After I had addressed their Lordships, Mr. PHILLIMORE addressed them in answer. The Committee-room (which was the Painted Chamber) was then cleared. In about ten minutes, probably, we were called in again, and were informed by the Noble Lord in the Chair, that their Lordships had voted, that the preamble **HAD NOT BEEN PROVED TO BE TRUE!** Thus then, their Lordships decided, in fact, that the House of Commons had been imposed upon; that it had been induced to enact

that which was false; and that my petition contained the truth, as far at least as the preamble was concerned.

Thus, then, the reader's anxiety for me will be at an end; and, indeed, I should here put an end to my account of the matter, were I not convinced that something ought to be done with regard to this road, as soon as the time arrives for passing another Act; something effectual I mean; and, that which took place before the Committee of the Lords is interesting on this account.

There were three parts of the Bill upon which I had to remark: FIRST, That paragraph of the Preamble, which forms paragraph two of my Petition above inserted. SECOND, A Section of the Bill relative to the weighing of wagons and carts loaded with lime and some other things. THIRD, All that part of the Bill which relates to the purchasing and pulling down of houses.

As to the FIRST, the exceptionable paragraph of the preamble contains two distinct allegations, as reasons for passing the Bill, both of which allegations are false. The fact is, that a considerable sum of money owed by the road *cannot be paid off*, and the thousand pounds a-year be paid to St.

George's, Hanover-square, unless the term and powers of the old Act be put into a new Act. Here is a clear unmixed falsehood; for, as the foregoing account shows, one thousand five hundred pounds is the whole of the debt of the road, and the Treasurer has a balance of four thousand five hundred and three pounds in his hands; so that, after paying off the whole of the debt, the Treasurer has three thousand and three pounds in his hands! If this be not then a *barefaced falsehood*, when did a barefaced falsehood find its way into print. The road, according to law, is to pay a thousand pounds a-year to assist in paving Piccadilly, that is paid to the Committee of the parish of St. George's, Hanover-square. This thousand pounds a-year has been regularly paid. It was paid last year. A thousand pounds of debt was paid off last year. An extra expense of nearly a thousand pounds took place last year, on account of a sewer; and, after all, the Treasurer had, as we see by the account, four thousand five hundred pounds left in his hands! And yet these people had had the audacity to state to the House of Commons, that they wanted an Act of Parliament for twenty-one years

longer, to make them able to pay off a debt of one thousand five hundred pounds. Being pushed hard upon this point, by several of their Lordships, they pretended that they did not mean that they were unable to pay off their debt; but that, they should be unable to pull down *eighty-six houses*, and to make magnificent improvements. Yes, but how came they to say then, that they could not pay off their debt, without this new Bill? It curiously came out from their clerk, Mr. BATTY, that they had, while the Bill was before the Commons, paid off one thousand pounds out of the fifteen hundred, leaving a debt of only five hundred pounds, which, too, they were going to pay off in the course of a month or two! So that, here were these men, getting the Parliament to enact that another twenty-one year's Bill was necessary to enable them to pay off their debt; and, they were actually paying off that very debt, while that Bill was passing! If any man happens to know of any thing so impudent as this, I shall be obliged to him to give me the particulars.

Pushed extremely hard upon this point; no one daring to swear that they could not pay off four thousand pounds with four thou-

sand five hundred pounds, they resorted to their *Surveyor*, who came forth with that species of conscious importance which naturally appertains to a showman. He had a whole budget of pictures or plans, which he drew forth one after another, with great deliberation and ceremony. He really put me in mind of the show-people at fares, who entertain children at a halfpenny a-head. He was so tedious with his conceited explanations, that I grew excessively weary of him, and I thought that the greater part of his audience seemed to set but very little value upon his wares.

This became somewhat of a serious personage, however, before we had done with him; for, he told the Committee, that the intended improvements in Kensington High-street alone, would cost about *forty thousand pounds*! There being twenty-three houses at Kensington, and eighty-six houses in the whole, the whole cost would be, of course, a **HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINE THOUSAND POUNDS**! And this too, the reader will observe, without a single word being said to prove, that the "TRUST" were likely to get possession of the mines of Peru. Good God! Here was **TEN THOUSAND** a-year

bespoke for fifteen years out of the twenty-one. The present income is fourteen thousand a-year, besides three hundred a-year for the Statute-duty. And here are ten thousand a-year bespoke beforehand for the first fifteen years. And now, reader, I beg you to observe the answers to two questions which I put to this man.

Q. Do you think that the Trust can make all these great alterations *without any addition to their present income?*

A. Yes; *I think they might!*

Q. Do you think that they could pay for all these contemplated changes, and with a *considerably diminished income?*

A. Yes; *I do.*

"Then," said I, "I have no more questions to ask you." What, reader, they have now an income of fourteen thousand a-year; that income can, according to their Surveyor, be considerably diminished; and yet, they will be able to pay ten thousand a-year in addition to their present payments! And, oh! monstrous! While this is the case, they want a new Bill to be passed in order to enable them to pay their present debt! I defy the oldest legal practitioner living to say that he ever heard the like of this before.

However, we are far short yet of the climax, for, this very Bill, which says that the road cannot pay its debt, and pay the paving Commissioners at the same time; and that it cannot pay for improvements as it could wish without the *aid* of a new Bill; this road is to receive from the new Bill, the assistance which is to be found in a lessening of its income! In short, according to the new Bill, the tolls at all the gates except those at Hyde Park Corner and Pimlico, are, or, rather, they were, to be reduced on an average, two-fifths; and my calculation is, that, upon the whole, the new Bill makes a reduction of *one-fourth* part! Strange thing, indeed! Who, upon reading the preamble so often quoted, would not imagine that the tolls were about to be raised in place of being lowered? Here is a road in debt; it cannot pay off its debt and pay St. George's parish, nor can it widen and amend itself properly, unless it be favoured with a new Bill; and yet that new Bill is to take away a fourth part of its income! Take, then, this preamble, and take along with it the Section for lowering the Tolls; or, rather, compare the old Act with the new Act relative to the tolls. Then look at the new Bill, carried

up and presented to the House of Lords by the House of Commons ; and then ask what it is that the House of Commons says to the House of Lords in this Bill. In substance they say this : “ Here “ are these unfortunate people of “ the Kensington Trust. They are “ so much in debt ; they have so “ much to pay to St. George’s “ parish every year ; they have so “ many houses to pull down in order “ to make the road passable ; their “ pecuniary embarrassments are so “ great ; their situation is, in short, “ so deplorable, that it will be “ absolutely impossible for the “ poor fellows to get along, unless “ your lordships shall be charitably disposed to agree with us “ in the Bill that we have passed “ for taking away one-fourth part “ of their present income ! ”

This is in substance what the House of Commons says to the House of Lords. Say what they will of the Honourable House, never did it before pass a Bill like this.

I explained to the Committee the cause of this unparalleled self-contradiction. The “ TRUST,” long life to them, had not, *at first*, the smallest intention of lowering the tolls. I beg the reader to mark that. The Bill which was passed by the House of Commons

and sent to the Lords, is by no means the same Bill that was at first brought into the House of Commons. That Bill contained all the same provisions that the old Bill contained, with the exception of the filling up of the blanks, and those were manifestly intended to be filled up with *higher* and not lower sums than they were formerly. In this form the Bill was read a first and a second time in the House of Commons. But, now mark : while the Bill was in this state, I and about a hundred of the people about Kensington and Fulham, petitioned against the Bill, and prayed the House to pass no Bill on the subject, which did not pray for a lowering of tolls. At the same time, I had made application for obtaining this *famous account* which we have now before us. The “ Trust ” saw that the Treasurer’s *balances would come to light* ! But, oh ! reader ! If you have any bowels, show compassion to the “ Trust.” They had **PROVED THEIR PREAMBLE** before the Commons. They could not **UNPROVE** the preamble ; poor souls, they could make no alteration in that ; but they could alter the enactments. So that, to work they went, and took out the whole of the Table of High Tolls, which table they had got into

the first Bill! Hence this glaring, this matchless piece of inconsistency. They begin the Bill like beggars, pleading poverty like people begging for a piece of bread. Directly afterwards they *fling up a fourth of their income*; and even after that, their Surveyor says he can make improvements, a part of which will cost forty thousand pounds, though they do give up a considerable part of their present income.

Such wondrous things as these are not witnessed every day. But now let me, before I quit this stupenduous preamble, remark on the second allegation which it contains, and which is also a falsehood. It is in these words: "Nor
" can the said roads be effectually
" amended, widened, improved
" and maintained in repair, unless
" the term and powers granted by
" the said two first recited Acts,
" be *continued*, and further pro-
" visions be made for *that* pur-
" pose."

The word *that*, we may, I think, set down to the nonsense account; for, it should be those purposes, unless it mean the purpose of continuing the Act, and then, what sense is there in the word *further*? Laying aside this nonsense, however, let us come to the falsehood, of which I have been speaking.

The two Acts here spoken of were passed, one in 1795, and the other in 1811. Now, this preamble says, that unless the powers granted by these Acts be continued, the road cannot be properly kept in repair. Well, then, this Bill does *not continue* some of the most important of those powers. Certainly the most important of those powers are the powers to collect tolls; and the new Bill, so far from continuing the powers of the old Bill in this respect, actually takes away one fourth part of those powers: so that, in place of one falsehood in this preamble, there are two. I now come to the *second* objection which I stated in this Bill. It contained a clause authorising toll-collectors to weigh *all carts, wagons, &c. &c.* loaded with lime, breeze, ashes, or cinders, or with turnips or mangel wurzel, and to make such carts and wagons pay toll for overweight, provided, however, that such carts or wagons had narrow wheels. Now, the Act 4 Geo. 4. chap. 95, section 19, enacts that nothing about the breadth of wheels, that no regulations of weight, that no tolls payable in respect of wheels or of weight, shall extend to any cart not drawn by more than one horse or two oxen. So that, here we

have this charming absurdity, that the "*Trust*" will weigh my one-horse cart (for they set aside the general Act by this Section); the "*Trust*" will weigh my cart; if my cart have narrow wheels, and have lime, breeze, ashes, cinders or turnips or mangel wurzel on board, the "*Trust*" have taken it into their heads and they will weigh my one-horse cart; but if my one-horse cart with narrow wheels, the same identical cart that they weighed yesterday with ashes on board, go through the same gate to-day, laden with iron of ten times the weight of the ashes, the "*Trust*" will not then weigh it at all. I may put, in short, as much weight as I please upon my one-horse cart, except lime, breeze, ashes, cinders, turnips, or mangel wurzel, to heavy loads of which six things, the "*Trust*" seem to have taken a particular dislike.

What is to be expected from men who could stuff a clause like this into an Act of Parliament? What everlasting confusion must there be; what quarrelling, what extortions at the toll-gates, if Turnpike Acts be formed in this sort of way? It is curious enough, that the absurdity with regard to this clause should have been contagious. Mr. PHILLIMORE, when he came to reply to my observa-

tions upon this part of the Bill, offered (at the suggestion, I believe, of the agent for the Bill), to *strike out the clause!* That is to say, to *destroy the Bill*; for, it being a *money* affair, if altered by the Lords, the Bill was lost.

My third objection to the Bill was that it was not at all calculated for the occasion; that it *continued the powers in the same hands* for twenty-one years yet to come; that I thought nothing of this lowering of the tolls; that it was a patchwork affair; that I preferred waiting until next year, when some wise and just plan might be adopted; and when the gates at Pimlico and at Hyde Park Corner might be wholly removed; and that, too, with even lower tolls at the other gates than those contemplated by the present Act. The "*Trust*" reckon eighteen miles of road. I endeavoured to show this fallacy in its true light. I said to their Lordships what I repeat here, namely, that, after much thought upon the subject; after what I deem pretty accurate calculation, I give it as my decided opinion, that the tolls may be lowered at all the other gates, that Hyde Park Corner and Pimlico gates may be wholly plucked up and taken away, and that the roads

may be kept in better repair than they are now. My real opinion is, that Mr. M'Adam, or any man who well understands the management of roads, would keep the roads in excellent repair, pay what is now paid for the watching and lighting, pay St. George's parish the thousand pounds a-year, and put two or three thousand pounds a-year, clear money, in his pocket; and this, you will understand, without any gates at Pimlico or Hyde Park Corner.

Mr. PHILLIMORE said, that there was an untruth in my petition; for, that, towards the close of the petition, I stated that the present Act had *two years yet* to come. This was not the case, he said, for that the present Act expired next April. Those learned gentlemen take pretty great liberties with facts at all times, and especially when they have their wigs on. The present Act is to continue and be in force, until the 4th of April, 1825, "and from thence to the end of the *then next Session of Parliament*;" that is to say, until about the month of July 1826! And yet Mr. PHILLIMORE had the conscience to tell their Lordships that the Bill expires in the *month of April next*; and that my petition contained a falsehood, when it

said that the present Act had two years yet to run. There is, therefore, plenty of time; and I am very much mistaken if there will not be somebody to prepare a Bill that shall not be liable to objections like those preferred against the Bill of this "*Trust*."

It is a most desirable thing to remove that nuisance, the Toll at Hyde Park Corner. And no effort of mine shall be wanting to effect that purpose. But, this is a subject which requires more time than I have to spare at present. My readers will be anxious to see me return to it; and return to it I shall, and, I hope, never quit it, until I see the gate at Hyde Park Corner removed, and that brightest spot in England, and, perhaps, in Europe, totally cleared of that odious and filthy nuisance, which, provoking as it is, stands there at present for no other purpose than that of fostering and feeding a set of low men without taste, and without knowledge of any kind, other than that which confines itself to the care of number one.

Before I conclude, I must observe, that this has been rather an unfortunate week for the Turnpike 'Squires. My son, who, some time ago, undertook to put them to rights down at Battel in Sussex,

was, as the readers of the Register were informed, to have a hearing before the Magistrates at Battel on the 11th inst.; that is to say, on Tuesday last. There was a Bench of Magistrates held at Battel on that day; and before that Bench he brought a toll-renter's toll-collector, and had him convicted in the unmitigated penalty of five pounds.

These persons will find, from the proceedings at Battel, that the time for complaining is by no means past. They will also find, that they cannot be saved by any mitigating disposition in the magistrates. From the very first, I have always said that a *refunding* ought to take place. This I have constantly said. The lessees took the money. Took it through ignorance if you will; but that is not to prevent them from refunding. If I, by mistake, put your purse into my pocket, do I keep it there after I have discovered the mistake? If a tradesman bring me in a bill, and by an error in the casting up, receive a pound

too much from me, will he, when I make the error clear to him, say, "Yes, Sir, I have got a pound too much of your money, but having once got it, I will keep it"? If any man were to act thus, would he not be driven out of society as a rogue?

And why are these toll-renters not then to be deemed rogues? Yet, when I applied at Union Hall, Mr. SWABEY and the other magistrates there, did not appear to understand me, when I talked about *refunding*. They did not appear to understand any thing at all about the matter. If they should happen, by-and-by, to read the account of the proceedings at Battel, they will see that refunding on the part of lessees is as practicable as it is just.

The lessees in the neighbourhood of London may rest assured that I shall never be satisfied until they have refunded. I shall not, probably, undertake the matter myself; but, I trust my son will; and that he will not quit these lessees, until he have made

them refund to the last shilling. I know many and many poor men in my own neighbourhood, from each of whom these toll-renters have extorted from ten to twenty shillings. Is it not to be insolent and tyrannical to the last degree to keep this money from these poor men? The men are poor. They have no money to give for summonses. They cannot lose their time in seeking justice. Justice must, therefore, be sought for them by somebody else.

The way in which the matter has been settled at Battel is the proper way. My son does not want to put fines into his own pocket: he wants to obtain justice for those who have been wronged; and that justice he will obtain, I trust, before he has done.

WM. COBBETT.

THE CASE
OF
JOSEPH SWANN.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Apr. 10, 1824.

Mr. *J. Williams* said, he rose to present a Petition from an individual of the name of Joseph Swann, who was, he believed, the solitary remaining prisoner of those persons who were incarcerated and prosecuted in the year 1819. It was, though it had escaped his recollection, his lot to have prosecuted that individual. From the time that had elapsed, it was not to be wondered at that the circumstance had escaped his recollection. It appeared from the petition, that Mr. Swann had been a mechanic and artisan, residing at Macclesfield, in the county of Chester. In consequence of the very great distress, notorious to every man who heard him, that at that period prevailed throughout the whole of the manufacturing districts, the petitioner was compelled by necessity to change his means of exertion, and he became a vender of books and pamphlets. He was apprehended in the month of August 1819, on a charge

of selling blasphemous publications, and was detained in close custody till the October following, a period of eight weeks. Having been then discharged upon bail, he was a second time apprehended, on the 29th of December following, and detained at Middlewich to the January following. The petitioner stated, that during that latter period, he was chained with other prisoners. Without resting on the allegations of the petitioner, he (Mr. Williams), reflecting on the temper of those times, believed there was reason to fear that persons thus circumstanced were exposed to the extreme of rigour and violence. He was at length tried and convicted on three indictments—two for blasphemy, and the third for attending a Meeting at Macclesfield. For the purpose of convening that Meeting he had signed the requisition; but he stated positively, that at said Meeting he never uttered a word.

Whatever that was seditious was expressed through the medium of a person of the name of Buckley, who was also indicted with the petitioner. And yet, strange to say, that man Buckley—the principal in the proceedings of that Meeting, who was “the very head and front” of the im-

puted offence—though indicted, was never brought to trial to that hour, although at sundry times he had been subsequently seen at large at and in the vicinity of Macclesfield. It was impossible to explain how it was that the principal offender should be at large, and the accessory or the instrument should be thus rigorously punished! It was at least undeniable, that a punishment, which, for the three charges, comprehended an imprisonment of four years and three quarters, was a punishment carried to as great extent of severity as perhaps was exemplified in the history of political offences. For his part, though engaged in the prosecution, he (Mr. Williams) had nothing to do with the originating of the proceedings, and was not at all responsible for the rigour or extent of the punishment, [hear, hear, hear!] the sum and quantum of which would speak for itself. Indeed, when one considered its duration, it was impossible not to feel that it was marked with severity. At all events there was, under existing circumstances, sufficient to induce His Majesty's Government to reconsider its continuance and duration. Could it be forgotten that at that moment, very generally throughout the

country, and particularly in those districts, a series of distress and pressure prevailed, which every liberal minded man would see. Those who suffered under it would, however mistaken, impute not to the inflictions of fortune, but to the errors of Government. The Right Hon. Secretary for the Home Department (Mr. Peel) did, no doubt, feel that that season of suffering and discontent had passed away, and therefore he (Mr. Williams) trusted, that he had only to remind him that the petitioner was the solitary *remanet* of those political offenders of that season now lingering in a prison [hear, hear!]. It could not be forgotten either by that House, as it was not by the petitioning prisoner, that when the Right Honourable the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his financial exposition in the early part of the Session, he congratulated both Parliament and the country on the acknowledged feelings of a grateful people, and on the restoration of order, subordination, and constitutional obedience. He trusted that every other Member of the Government embraced those wise and liberal and generous feelings; and that they felt with the Right Honourable the Chancellor

of the Exchequer, that those acts of coercion, which temporary suffering and discontent produced, were, on the part of the Government and Legislature, the results of a hard and painful necessity. If such punishments were the remedies for particular disorders, was it wise, was it prudent, was it humane, to continue them, when those disorders which were the cause had happily disappeared? He put it to His Majesty's Government to take into their consideration all the circumstances of the petitioner's case. A few months longer, and his imprisonment would be brought to a close, with those feelings in the public mind which usually accompanied excessive and disproportionate punishment, namely, a turning away of all disapprobation of the offence, and the conversion of a culprit into a martyr. The petitioner was the only remaining individual of those whom, in the temperate language of the Right Honourable the Chancellor of the Exchequer, hard necessity had induced His Majesty's Government to cast into captivity; and he appealed to their good feeling, now that that hard necessity was over, as to the humanity of liberating him.

Mr. James observed, that for the

severe punishment which this individual had experienced, and which arose out of the political agitations of 1819, the Magistrates were deeply responsible. It was unwarrantable, and could with difficulty be paralleled in the history of political persecution, especially under "an unpaid Magistracy." The discretion which had been used on this occasion was truly what had been very justly called "a fiend discretion." The petitioner was innocent of all criminal acts; he merely attended a public meeting, where he did not utter a syllable; but a Mr. Buckley made what was called an inflammatory speech. To show that the Magistrates of the district were ashamed of what had been done, they had for twelve months been inducing the gaoler to endeavour to persuade Swann to petition for a remission of his sentence. He had not thought proper to comply with their wish, and was prepared to suffer the extent of his punishment, in order to afford a specimen of the severity with which an individual might be treated under a free Government, which was "the envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world." Who, after such an example, could stand up in that House, and else-

where, and talk of the boasted liberty of Englishmen?

Mr. Secretary Peel observed, that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman who presented the petition had mentioned the subject to him only yesterday, when he (Mr. Peel) had observed, that as it related to circumstances which occurred four years ago, two years before he was in office, he could of course have no knowledge respecting it; that therefore, if the Honourable and Learned Gentleman presented the petition this day, he (Mr. Peel) could not obtain any information as to those circumstances; but that if it pleased the Honourable and Learned Gentleman to postpone presenting the petition, he (Mr. Peel) would inquire, and, from the character of the Magistrates, was persuaded that he should obtain every necessary explanation. As the matter stood, the allegations in the petition were merely those of the petitioner himself; and it was singular, that nearly four years had elapsed before he had made any such complaint. With respect to the severity of the punishment that had been inflicted in this case, he begged to say a few words. Of course, all appeals to Parliament against the exercise of

the prerogative of the Crown, in withholding mercy from offenders, were appeals against the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whose duty it was to advise the Crown in such matters. Now, he readily allowed that he had not advised His Majesty to remit the punishment of the individual in question, nor was it his intention so to advise His Majesty. No fine had been inflicted on the petitioner. On finding securities for his good behaviour, he would be liberated at the expiration of the term to which he had been sentenced by the law, and it was not his intention to advise His Majesty to shorten that term. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman needed not have defended himself from any imputed inconsistency in having presented this petition, although he had been counsel in the prosecution of the petitioner. In the latter capacity, the Honourable and Learned Gent. had discharged his duty ably and temperately, and had obtained a verdict against the petitioner; but there was certainly no impropriety whatever in his now presenting a petition from the same individual, praying for the interference of the House in his behalf. The petitioner had been tried on five indictments, one for

blasphemous, and two for seditious, libels; one for a seditious conspiracy, and the other for blasphemy. On three of those indictments he had been convicted. He had been convicted of publishing a blasphemous libel and a seditious libel, and he had also been convicted of sedition. He had not erred without sufficient notice and warning of the probable consequences of his offence; but he was one of many who were at that time deeply engaged in the infamous traffic in seditious and blasphemous publications. His father resided at Stockport, and sold such publications, and his son was sent to Macclesfield for the same purpose. He had instigated and compelled his wife to embark in the same traffic. On the whole, therefore, although four years was an unusual extent of imprisonment, yet, after the warning which the petitioner had received, and after all the circumstances of the case, he (Mr. Peel) did not conceive that it was too severe an infliction. As to the charge of sedition, he would refer to the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's own address to the Jury by whom the petitioner was tried, in which the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, after admitting that freedom of discussion

was one of the first rights of Englishmen, maintained that the publication on which the prisoner was charged was calculated "to stir the people up to a contempt of His Majesty's Government."

The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had also observed, that the work spoke too of a Convention—a term borrowed from the worst times of the French Revolution. It ought also not to be forgotten, that the conduct of the petitioner while in the Court had been contemptuous and offensive in the extreme. He insulted the Bench, and held up his white hat, which was at that time the symbol of the party by whom the tranquillity of the country was menaced. All these circumstances combined to shew the impropriety of extending mercy to such an individual. As to the observations in the speech of his Right Honourable Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, respecting the returning prosperity of the country, that had no reference to the very different circumstances of

1819—circumstances of which the petitioner had availed himself to incite the people, and to carry on his revolutionary designs. The Honourable Member for Carlisle had said, that if this person were not released, this country would in vain be called the land of freedom. Now really he (Mr. Peel) was at a loss to conceive how allowing the law to take its course with respect to any individual who had violated it, was prejudicial to the freedom of others. On three distinct charges the Jury, by whom this person had been tried, had expressed their conviction of his guilt. When he considered all these things; when he considered the nature of the crime which the petitioner had committed, the circumstances of the period at which it had been committed, and the total absence of all acknowledgment of offence on the part of the culprit, he certainly did not feel that he should be warranted in recommending such a person to His Majesty for a remission of any part of his sen-

tence; and notwithstanding what had been said in the course of the present evening, it was not his intention to do so.

Mr. Hume observed, that the petitioner did not ask for mercy. That he was above doing. What he complained of, was the injustice of his sentence. It was, indeed, such a sentence as was seldom witnessed in this country. A blasphemous libel! What was a blasphemous libel? Was that to be determined by the opinion of the Magistracy of the County of Lancaster? Up to the present moment, the petitioner knew nothing of the contents of the work, which he was charged with publishing. Under such circumstances, even to prosecute him was an act of cruelty. The Right Honourable Gentleman was mistaken in saying that the petitioner excited the people to sedition and insurrection. He had never opened his mouth. Under such circumstances, he (Mr. Hume) repeated, that the punishment inflicted upon the petitioner was unprecedented. To add

to its severity, he had, in the first instance, been confined in one of the condemned cells, and fed on bread and water, and then removed to the felons' ward, clothed in a felon's dress, and denied the use of pen and ink, and the sight of his wife, who was in a dangerous state of health. There was nothing in the circumstances of the prisoner's case which warranted such barbarous proceedings. Nor was it just that such individuals as Trafford Trafford should sit in judgment on a case in which they had themselves taken so active a part. Notwithstanding the eulogiums from time to time bestowed on "the unpaid Magistracy" of the country, it appeared to him to be extremely inexpedient to give them the power of imprisonment to such an extent as in the present instance. He regretted extremely that the Right Honourable Gentleman, or his predecessor in office, had not long ago taken all these circumstances into consideration, and advised the

King to put an end to the petitioner's imprisonment. Now, whenever he came out of prison, he would come out a persecuted individual.

Mr. *Sykes* expressed his hope that at least, considering the severity of the sentence in other respects, the petitioner would not be called upon for his sureties.

After a short explanation from Mr. Secretary *Peel*, the Petition was brought up, and read as follows :

"To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, the humble Petition of Joseph Swann, now a prisoner in Chester Castle,

Sheweth,

"That in the year 1819 your Petitioner resided at Macclesfield, and carried on a small trade in books and pamphlets. That your Petitioner was arrested on the 21st August, 1819, and taken to Middlewich, whence, at the Session, he was removed to Knutsford, and charged (as he believes)

upon three indictments, of which he knew nothing till that moment ; two of these indictments were for alleged libels contained in some of the books which your Petitioner, in the course of his business, had sold ; and the other indictment was for being present at a public meeting, held at Macclesfield on the 31st July, 1819 ; your Petitioner traversed, and was liberated on bail, after being kept in prison for eight weeks, during which time bail had been frequently offered for him and refused.

"That your Petitioner, with his wife, then in an advanced state of pregnancy, was again arrested on the 28th December, 1819, and confined at Macclesfield, till the 1st January, 1820, when he was removed, in irons, to Middlewich, and on the following night your Petitioner's wife was liberated.

"That, on the 10th of January, 1820, your Petitioner was dragged through the public road, linked to a chain, with a number of other prisoners, to Chester, a distance of about twenty miles ; and on the 12th he was taken into Court, but instead of being tried on the indictments, for which he had traversed at the Knutsford Sessions, and on which he was pre-

pared to defend himself, two other indictments were exhibited, one for blasphemy, and the other for sedition. On these, your Petitioner was that day tried and convicted; but to the present moment he has no knowledge of what the libels are, except the imperfect knowledge he was able to obtain from the indistinct reading of them in Court, on his trial. Your Petitioner had never previously read them, and he was then, and still remains entirely ignorant of the other contents, and even of the titles of the Pamphlets from which they were selected. That on the same day your Petitioner was tried with five others for being present at a meeting held at Macclesfield on the 31st July, 1819, for the purpose of taking "into consideration," as it stated in the requisition by which it was convened, "the most steady and proper means to be pursued for reforming the representation of the country."—That on this trial it was proved by the witnesses for the prosecution, that, though your Petitioner had signed the requisition for the Meeting, yet that he did not say a word, nor in any manner interfere, to influence its proceedings, and that the Meeting itself was quite orderly and peaceable. The whole case for

the prosecution rested entirely on expressions which were attributed by some of the witnesses to a person named Wm. Buckley, who was upon the hustings, but who was not one of the persons by whom the Meeting had been convened. All the observations, which the Counsel for the prosecution addressed to the Jury, and the inferences he drew against the Meeting, were founded expressly on what Buckley was stated to have said. What he said was the subject of all the evidence, and was the point alone on which the Chairman, Trafford Trafford, Esq., dwelt, in his charge to the Jury, inculcating your Petitioner and the other defendants, whose individual conduct had been unobjectionable, by strongly pressing upon the Jury, "that what fell from Buckley in the course of the Meeting, was equally applicable to the whole of the defendants;" and yet, your Petitioner assures your Honourable House, that Buckley himself, though included in the indictment, has never been tried, nor otherwise brought to any account for his conduct on this occasion, though, as your Petitioner is credibly informed and believes the said William Buckley now is, and has been, with scarcely any exception,

from the time of your Petitioner's trial, openly residing in Stockport and Macclesfield, to both the inhabitants and the police of which towns he is well known.

" That your Petitioner was convicted also on the charge arising out of his connexion with this Meeting, and on the following morning he was sentenced by Trafford Trafford, Esq. to be imprisoned two years for one libel, half a year for the other, and two years more for attending the Meeting, making a term of four years and a half, besides the ten weeks of imprisonment and suffering which he had previously endured, and all this for having sold, in the course of his business, libels which he had never read, and attended a Meeting lawfully convened for a lawful purpose, and admitted to have been peaceable, at which he never spoke.

" That for the first week of his imprisonment, your Petitioner was confined in one of the condemned cells, and fed on bread and water; and that afterwards he was placed in the felons' ward, compelled to wear a felon's dress—denied pen, ink, and paper, and so rigorously excluded from intercourse out of the prison, as not to be allowed to

receive any intelligence even of his wife, then in a critical, and to him interesting and anxious state, until the end of March. This severity, Mr. Hudson, the gaoler, informed your Petitioner, was inflicted by the peremptory order of the Magistrates. Subsequently, your Petitioner has been treated with more humanity; partly, he believes, because it was found that his bodily health, and even his mind, was severely affected by his sufferings.

" That your Petitioner having nearly completed a term of imprisonment, exceeding, as he believes, that to which any other individual in modern times has been subjected for political offences, marked by severity as the punishments for such offences usually are, and feeling conscious that in his own case the punishment he has endured bears no proportion to his imputed delinquency, he humbly prays your Honourable House to take his case into consideration.

And your Petitioner

will ever pray, &c. &c."

This day is published, Price 2s. 6d.

Boards,

A RIDE of Eight Hundred Miles in FRANCE; containing a Sketch of the Face of the Country, of its Rural Economy, of the Towns and Villages, of Manufactures and Trade, and of such of the Manners and Customs as materially differ from those of England: ALSO, an Account of the Prices of Land,

House, Fuel, Food, Raiment, Labour, and other Things, in different parts of the Country; the design being to exhibit a true picture of the present State of the People of France. To which is added, a General View of the Finances of the Kingdom.

By JAMES PAUL COBBETT,

STUDENT OF LINCOLN'S INN.

Published by C. Clement, No. 183, Fleet-street.

MARKETS.

**Average Prices of CORN through-
out ENGLAND, for the week end-
ing 1st May.**

<i>Per Quarter.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Wheat	65	5
Rye	42	4
Barley	36	0
Oats	24	4
Beans	39	1
Peas	36	9

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

**Quantities and Prices of British
Corn, &c. sold and delivered in
this Market, during the week ended
Saturday, 1st May.**

<i>Qrs.</i>	<i>£.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Wheat.. 4,403 for 15,005	9	10	Average, 68	1	
Barley 3,053....	5,667	11	3.....	37	1
Oats.. 10,179....	13,601	8	2.....	26	8
Rye.... 1,100....	1,989	0	0.....	36	1
Beans .. 1,026....	1,910	5	8.....	37	2
Peas.... 271.....	480	3	7.....	35	5

Friday, May 7.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain this week are only moderate. Of Flour it is again considerable. Prime dry Wheats are eagerly sought after, and obtain rather more money, but damp sorts are still neglected. Barley remains as on Monday. Beans find sale readily at last quotations. Peas still remain dull. Oats sold with more freedom, and obtained rather higher prices than Monday.

Monday, May 10.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain last week were only moderate, but of Flour it was again considerable. This morning there are middling quantities of

Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, fresh in from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, and several vessels from the north with Oats: The trade for Wheat has been chiefly confined to dry samples of New, which have fully maintained last week's quotations, but sales of other sorts cannot be effected, though offered on lower terms.

There is great probability, from the state of the averages, that the bonded Barley will be liberated at the duty, of which the quantity is about 14,000 quarters in London, and about 28,000 quarters more in other parts of the country; the Barley trade is in consequence thereof very dull, and 1s. to 2s. per quarter lower. Beans sell heavily, and hardly maintain last quotations. In Peas of both kinds no variation in prices, and little doing. Having more Oats at market to-day than on Friday, the trade is not so brisk as on that day, and although the prices are reported 1s. per quarter dearer, yet the sale is by no means free. The Flour trade still continues nearly in a state of stagnation.

Prices on board Ship as under.

Wheat, red, (old)	62s. to 72s.
— white, (old)	48s. — 78s.
— red, (new)	42s. — 48s.
— fine	50s. — 54s.
— superfine	56s. — 63s.
— white, (new)	48s. — 52s.
— fine	54s. — 62s.
— superfine	65s. — 70s.
Flour, per sack	55s. — 60s.
— Seconds	50s. — 55s.
— North Country	46s. — 50s.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½d. by the full-priced Bakers.

ACCOUNT OF WHEAT, &c. ARRIVED IN THE PORT OF LONDON,
From May 3 to May 8, both inclusive.

Whence.	Wheat.	Barley	Malt.	Oats.	Beans.	Flour.
Aberdeen
Aldbrough
Alemouth	60	1595
Banff
Bridgewater
Berwick	595	15
Bridport
Boston	2960	70
Bridlington	400
Clay	120	285
Dartmouth
Colchester	141	65	1025	115	1564
Harwich	561	1490	130	490
Leigh	1386	61	40	14	338	133
Maldon	443	92	20	98	1643
Eastbourne	142
Exeter	100
Gainsborough	170	20
Hastings
Hull	510	130
Ipswich	45	77	2488	4	675
Kent	1724	416	190	172	315	1195
Leith	135
Louth	250
Lyme	100
Lynn	242	640	305
Poole	50
Rye	30
Spalding	360
Shoreham	14
Stockton	320
Southwold	351	291	35
Whitby	60
Wisbeach	1820	30
Woodbridge	259	302	115	147	309
Yarmouth	200	830	1771	2620
Dunbar
Galway
Kinsale
Waterford
Foreign
Total	5719	2254	7189	9646	1182	8

Aggregate Quantity of other kinds of Pulse imported during the Week:

Rye, — ; Pease, 401 ; Tares, 755 ; Linseed, — ; Rapeseed, — ;
Brank, 10 ; Mustard, 185 ; Flax, — ; and Seeds, 136 quarters.

SEEDS, &c.

Price on board Ship as under.

Clover, red, Foreign per cwt	50	82
— white, ditto..ditto ..	44	76
— red, English, ditto ..	58	80
— white, ditto..ditto ..	52	74
Rye Grass	per qr... 25	44
Turnip, new, white..per bush.	10	12
— red & green ..ditto..	10	16
— yellow Swedes ditto..	9	11
Mustard, white	ditto.. 7	11
— brown.....ditto..	8	14
Carraway	per cwt 50	52
Coriander.....ditto ..	8	13
Sanfoin.....	per qr... 30	38
Trefoil	per cwt 18	25
Ribgrass	ditto .. 28	40
Canary, common ..per qr...	40	48
— fine	ditto.. 48	60
Tares	per bush. 3	5
Hempseed	per qr... 38	42
Linseed for crushing		
Foreign	ditto .. 30	40
— fine English		
for sowing	ditto .. 42	48
Rapeseed, 26l. to 28l. per last.		
Foreign Tares, 2s. 6d. to 4s.		
Linseed Oil Cake, 10l. to 10l. 10s. per 1000		
Foreign ditto, 6l. to 6l. 10s. per ton.		
Rape Cake, 4l. 15s. to 5l. per ton.		

Monday, May 10.—There were no arrivals from Ireland last week; from Foreign ports, 4237 casks of Butter.

City, 12 May 1824.

BACON.

The most opulent of the Irish manufacturers are holding back their stocks; and the Cheesemong-ers being, as they always are, eager to import, they are compelled to give to such of the manufacturers as choose to sell, prices which they

cannot realize here. This has been the case through the present season; there has been a loss upon importation from the beginning. The supplies from Belfast are likely to be very great this season.—On board, 53s. to 54s.—Landed, 55s. to 56s.

BUTTER.

There has been a heavy loss upon all kinds of Butter this season; the English factors have lost 30s. per cwt. upon great quantities. Prices remain about the same as last week.

CHEESE.

The holders of Cheese begin to be alarmed, and have already given way in price upon some kinds. Some factors have been speculating.—Cheshire, 63s. to 80s.—Double Gloucester, 64s. to 72s.—Derby, 63s. to 70s.—Fine Somerset, 76s. to 80s.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, May 10.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	6	to	4 2
Mutton.....	3	8	—	4 6
Veal.....	5	0	—	6 0
Pork.....	4	4	—	5 4
Lamb	5	8	—	7 0

Beasts ... 2,023 | Sheep ... 17,900
Calves 150 | Pigs 240

NEWGATE (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	2	8	to	3 8
Mutton.....	3	0	—	4
Veal.....	3	4	—	5
Pork.....	3	0	—	5
Lamb.....	4	4	—	6

LEADENHALL, May 10.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	6	to	3 6
Mutton.....	3	0	—	4 0
Veal.....	3	4	—	5 0
Pork.....	4	0	—	5 0
Lamb.....	4	8	—	6 0

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay .. 90s. to 115s.
 Straw...40s. to 48s.
 Clover 100s. to 130s.

St. James's.—Hay.....80s. to 126s.
 Straw...36s. to 51s.
 Clover 100s. to 130s.

Whitechapel. Hay ..90s. to 120s.
 Straw. 42s. to 50s.
 Clover..100 to 135s.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.
Aylesbury	58	64	0	35	38	0	25	28	0	32	45	0	38	40	0
Banbury	56	64	0	35	39	0	23	27	0	36	41	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	54	70	0	32	35	0	22	25	0	40	46	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	54	64	0	24	30	6	20	22	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	52	70	0	34	39	0	25	30	0	34	44	0	33	36	0
Derby	64	80	0	38	45	0	26	32	0	44	58	0	0	0	0
Devize.....	40	72	0	28	30	0	26	28	0	40	46	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	48	78	0	25	32	0	21	24	0	40	46	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	66	76	0	28	35	0	18	24	0	40	44	0	0	0	0
Guildford	56	72	0	34	40	0	24	30	0	40	48	0	38	42	0
Henley	50	80	0	35	40	0	22	29	0	37	44	0	38	45	0
Horncastle.....	58	68	0	26	36	0	18	26	0	36	50	0	0	0	0
Hungerford.....	46	68	0	26	34	0	18	30	0	36	44	0	0	0	0
Lewes	56	66	0	34	36	0	24	28	0	38	42	0	0	0	0
Lynn	50	64	0	28	33	0	20	25	0	38	39	0	0	0	0
Newbury	48	74	0	25	35	0	23	28	0	37	40	0	40	0	0
Newcastle	50	70	0	30	38	0	22	29	0	38	42	0	36	44	0
Northampton....	60	65	0	32	38	6	22	25	0	38	43	0	0	0	0
Nottingham	64	0	0	40	0	0	27	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	47	79	0	27	43	0	22	28	0	35	43	0	34	43	0
Stamford.....	56	70	0	29	40	0	20	30	0	36	42	0	0	0	0
Swansea	65	0	0	38	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	61	0	0	37	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	52	76	0	35	40	0	24	30	0	38	44	0	34	42	0
Warminster.....	44	72	0	25	38	0	22	30	0	40	54	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	44	72	0	30	36	0	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yarmouth.....	60	65	0	30	34	0	24	28	0	36	37	0	34	48	0
Dalkeith*	30	36	0	25	32	6	21	27	0	21	24	0	21	24	0
Haddington*....	26	37	0	28	32	6	20	26	0	18	22	0	20	24	0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, May 4.—This market has continued during the past week as uninteresting and dull as last observed, and consequently the sales of Wheat, Oats, Flour, &c. have been very trivial during that period; and at this day's market there was a very scanty appearance of Country Dealers, and so little business done, that prices of last Tuesday remain nominally the same as then advised.

Imported into Liverpool from the 27th April to the 3d May, inclusive:—Wheat, 2,660; Oats, 10,681; Barley, 1,036; Malt, 750; Beans, 448; Peas, 12; and Rye, 3 qrs. Oatmeal, 649 packs, of 240 lbs. Flour, 888 sacks, of 280 lbs.; American barrels, 367 of 196 lbs.

Norwich, May 8.—The Wheat trade revived a little to-day, but for Barley there is little demand. Wheat fetched 60s. to 65s.; Barley, 27s. to 31s.; and Oats, 26s. to 30s. per qr.

Bristol, May 8.—Little business is doing here in Corn, &c. The few sales that were made may be quoted as below:—Best Wheat from 8s. to 8s. 6d.; inferior ditto, 5s. 6d. to 7s. 6d.; Barley, 2s. 9d. to 5s.; Oats, 2s. 6d. to 3s. 6d.; Beans, 3s. 9d. to 5s. 3d.; and Malt, 5s. to 7s. 6d. per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30s. to 50s. per bag.

Birmingham, May 6.—An improved disposition might be observed to manifest itself in the purchases of Wheat to-day: supply only moderate. Barley, of fine quality for malting, being scarce, continues to be in good demand, while ordinary samples are entirely neglected, excepting for grinding purposes. Beans and Oats maintain recent quotations firmly, and sell freely. Malt is a heavy sale, and so is Flour. Prices, throughout the trade, about the same as last week.

Ipswich, May 8.—We had a good supply of Wheat at market to-day, and but little of other Grain. Wheat was full 2s. per quarter dearer, while other Grain was extremely dull in sale, and rather lower. Prices, as follow:—Wheat, 55s. to 67s.; Barley, 30s. to 34s.; Beans, 36s. to 38s.; and Oats, 26s. to 28s. per quarter.

Wisbech, May 8.—We had rather a scanty supply of samples of Corn this day, but what little business was done in both Wheat and Oats was on better terms for the grower than last week.

Boston, May 5.—This day's market was well supplied with samples of Grain, particularly Wheat, but the farmers would not submit to a reduction in price since last week's market. For the best samples of Oats there was a higher price demanded. Beans are brisk in demand. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 63s. to 66s.; Oats, 24s. to 26s.; and Beans, 39s. to 45s. per quarter.

Wakefield, May 7.—The arrivals of Wheat this week are moderate; the market is bare of fine fresh samples, and for such there is a fair demand, at full as high rates as last noted, but middling samples continue very dull sale; there is, however, no disposition to offer at lower prices. The supply of Barley is large for the season; there has been very little inquiry for it to-day; the few sales made are at a decline of 2s. per qr. Oats and Shelling remain the same. Malt is very heavy sale, as also Beans, but prices are without alteration. Nothing doing in Rapeseed. —Wheat, old and new, 60s. to 74s.; Barley, 26s. to 35s.; Beans, old and new, 38s. to 49s. per qr. 63 lbs. per bushel; Potatoe Oats, 28s. to 32s. per quarter; Meal Oats, 14d. to 14½d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Shelling, 36s. to 37s. per load of 261 lbs.; Malt, 42s. to 44s. per load of 6 bushels; Flour, 50s. to 53s. per sack of 280 lbs.; and Rapeseed, 25½. to 28½. per last.

Malton, May 8.—Our Corn market continues very dull. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 70s. to 74s. per quarter, five stone per bushel. Barley, 32s. to 34s. per quarter. Oats, 13d. to 14d. per stone.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended May 1, 1824.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London	69	2	37	2	25	9
Essex	66	9	38	1	26	7
Kent	64	5	37	4	25	4
Sussex	60	4	32	9	25	5
Suffolk	64	2	35	8	25	7
Cambridgeshire	62	6	35	4	21	11
Norfolk	63	8	34	1	25	2
Lincolnshire	65	5	38	9	22	7
Yorkshire	65	9	34	0	22	5
Durham	68	11	40	0	32	5
Northumberland	61	7	37	6	27	3
Cumberland	70	4	42	4	34	1
Westmoreland	62	11	47	0	33	7
Lancashire	68	7	0	0	30	6
Cheshire	67	11	44	11	29	10
Gloucestershire	64	5	34	5	25	10
Somersetshire	65	5	33	1	24	6
Monmouthshire	66	1	37	10	26	2
Devonshire	69	0	36	2	20	10
Cornwall	62	9	34	5	26	8
Dorsetshire	61	8	31	5	22	4
Hampshire	59	6	33	3	24	4
North Wales	73	8	45	3	25	5
South Wales	60	9	38	3	22	10

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended May 1.

Wheat..44,292 qrs. | Barley..19,971 qrs. | Beans....4,549 qrs.
Rye 1,132 qrs. | Oats....31,576 qrs. | Peas.....643 qrs.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, May 8.—There was a very good show of fat Beasts and Sheep to-day; but fat Beef was not saleable at more than 6s. per stone of 14 lbs.; good Hoggetts fetched 35s. per head; fat Mutton, 6s. 3d. to 6s. 6d. per stone.

Horncastle, May 8.—Beef, 6s. to 6s. 6d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 5d. to 6d.; Pork, 5d. to 6d.; Lamb, 9d. to 10d.; and Veal, 6d. to 8d. per lb.

Bristol, May 6.—Beef, 5d. to 6d.; Mutton, 5½d. to 6½d.; and Pork, 4½d. to 5d. per lb. sinking offal.

Malton, May 8.—Meat in the shambles:—Beef, 5d. to 6½d.; Mutton, 4½d. to 5½d.; Pork, 4d. to 4½d.; and Veal, 5d. to 6d. per lb. Fresh Butter, 12d. to 13d. per lb. Bacon Sides, 6s. 3d. to 6s. 6d.; Hams, 7s. 6d. to 9s. per stone.

At Morpeth market, on Wednesday, there was a good supply of Cattle and Sheep, and although there were many buyers, the former met with dull sale: prices much the same.—Beef, from 5s. to 5s. 6d.; and Mutton, 5s. 10d. to 6s. 6d. per stone, sinking offals.

Boston Fair, held on the 4th and 5th of May, was extremely well attended. On Tuesday the Show of Sheep was never known to be so large, and some prime lots sold as high as 43s. per head, and in general sold briskly at good prices, the market being cleared at an early hour in the day. The *Beast Fair*, held on the 5th, was largely attended. Meated Beasts sold well at advanced prices, and Store Beasts sold briskly.

At *Northallerton Fair*, the number of Horses for sale was not so great as at the last Fair. The dealers from various parts of the kingdom were numerous; some Foreign buyers also attended. Real good Horses fetched high prices, particularly Greys to match; all other kinds sold well. The Show of Cattle on Wednesday was great, and in general they sold well at an improvement in price, particularly good in-calvers for the south. The Show of Sheep on Thursday was great, and the sale dull, at reduced prices.

Price of HOPS, per Cwt. in the BOROUGH.

Monday, May 10.—The bines have grown considerably during the last week, though in many places they are weak and uneven. The market remains the same; but doing little.

Maidstone, May 6. — The fine weather this week has made great progress in the Hop plantations, the bines are much improved, and if they keep growing for another week as they have done lately, will be out of all danger as to the flea, which is considered a good beginning. No trade in the Old Hops at present.

Worcester, May 1.—25 pockets of Old Hops were this day weighed in our market. The average prices are as follow: 1818's, 40s. to 80s.;

1819's, 70s. to 105s.; 1820's, 70s. to 100s.; 1821's, 60s. to 100s.; 1822's, 140s. to 170s. Fine 1822's are scarce, and much inquired after. From our plantation, we learn that the plant continues to improve.

COTTON MARKET.

Friday, May 7.—The purchases of Cotton which have transpired this week are inconsiderable; it is reported several parcels have been taken privately, but no particulars have yet transpired; no alteration whatever in the currency can be stated.

COAL MARKET, May 7.

<i>Ships at Market.</i>	<i>Ships sold.</i>	<i>Price.</i>
58½ Newcastle..	49	29s. 6d. to 39s. 6d.
57 Sunderland	46½	30s. 0d.—40s. 6d.

This day is Published, Price 3s.

A LETTER TO THE REVEREND C. D. BRERETON,

In Reply to his Observations on the Administration of the Poor Laws in Agricultural Districts; containing also, some Remarks upon his attack on the Magistracy of the County of Norfolk; and tracing the great increase of Pauperism to its real source.

By W. COPLAND,

SHARRINGTON HALL, NORFOLK.

Sold by C. CLEMENT, 183, Fleet-street, London.

Printed and Published by C. CLEMENT, No. 183, Fleet-street.